



Apparatus claims 15-21 correspond to method claims 7-21 [sic] and [are] analyzed the same as discussed with respect to method claims 15-21 [sic]

image to a display as claimed (display 48). . .

Claims 7 and 15 of the present application correspond to claims 7 and 15 of the parent application. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection. Claim 7 recites a method for correcting an aspect ratio of an image captured by an image capture device. The method recited in claim 7 includes the steps of

determining if the aspect ratio of the image matches a predetermined aspect ratio; . . . decompressing the image if required; . . . cropping the image if the aspect ratio does not match the predetermined aspect ratio, thereby providing a cropped image; and . . . providing the image to a display.

Similarly, claim 15 recites a system for correcting the aspect ratio of an image captured by an image capture unit. The system recited in claim 15 includes

means for determining if the image requires cropping; means coupled to the determining means for decompressing the image if required;

means coupled to the decompressing means for cropping the image if the image requires cropping, thereby providing a cropped image; and means coupled to the cropping means for providing the image to a display.

Thus, the method and system recited in claims 7 and 15, respectively, crop the image and provide the cropped image to a display.

The present invention recited in claims 7 and 15 allows an image capture unit to display a cropped image. As a result, portrait and landscape images can be displayed clearly enough to allow a user to better recognize the contents of the image and without wasting as much space. Specification page 25, lines 14-18. Furthermore, the images can be displayed regardless of the aspect ration of the CCD being used. Specification page 22, lines 18-19. Thus, the present invention overcomes the problems associated with conventional digital cameras which may have CCDs which have a different aspect ratio from the aspect ration of the LCD screen used to





display images on the conventional digital camera, which compel the user to rotate the camera to view portrait images, or which provide portrait images having an aspect ratio different from that of the LCD screen. Specification, page 2, lines 5-11.

In contrast, Petruchik neither teaches nor suggests cropping the image and providing a cropped image to a display. The system disclosed in Petruchik provides markers which a user can move on a display screen to determine the image the user desires. Petruchik col. 2, lines 12-15; col. 4, lines 42-45; and Figure 4, item 50. Once the markers' positions are selected, the information is captured as editing information. This editing information is magnetically saved alongside the photographic image on the film. Petruchik col. 2, lines 34-35; col. 5, lines 9-12 and 19-22. This editing information is then used by a separate apparatus, depicted in Figure 7, to provide cropped prints of the images on the film. Petruchik col. 2, lines 43-45 and 46-48; col. 6, lines 4-5 and 14-19; and Figure 7.

Thus, Petruchik discloses using markers on the display screen and saving the information relating to the position on the markers. The camera disclosed in Figure 4 of Petruchik does not actually crop the image. Furthermore, the camera disclosed in Petruchik does not provide the cropped image to a display. Consequently, Petruchik neither teaches nor suggests the method and system recited in claims 7 and 15, respectively.

Although the Examiner pointed to box 74 of Figure 4 as a mechanism for cropping the image, Petruchik fails to teach or suggest cropping the image or providing the cropped image to a display. Despite the Examiner's contention that box 74 discloses cropping, Petruchik states that box 74 merely includes the "editing parameters selected by the previously described input elements . . . [that] become inputs to microprocessor 76 [of Figure 4]." Petruchik col. 5, lines 31-33. Thus, box 74 does not crop the image. As discussed above, Petruchik merely discloses moving markers on the display and saving the editing information relating to the markers'



positions. Petruchik col. 5, lines 33-40 and col. 4, line 46 - col. 5, line 8. Thus, Petruchik still fails to teach or suggest cropping the image or providing the cropped image to a display.

Consequently, Petruchik fails to teach or suggest the method and system recited in claims 7 and 15, respectively. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 7 and 15 are allowable as currently presented.

Claims 8-14 and 16-22 depend on claims 7 and 15, respectively. Consequently, the arguments herein apply with full force to claims 8-14 and 16-22. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 8-14 and 16-22 are allowable over Petruchik.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the claims in the application are patentable over the cited reference and are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections and objections is requested.

Applicant's attorney believes that this application is in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, Examiner is invited to call Applicant's attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Yanyoe R. Mitchell Attorney for Applicant

Reg. No. 40,095 (650) 493-4540